EXHIBIT A

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

----:

YURI GARMASHOV, : Case No.: 21-cv-4917

Plaintiff, :

V.

UNITED STATES PARACHUTE :

ASSOCIATION, INC., : New York, New York

Defendant. : May 3, 2023

----:

TRANSCRIPT OF STATUS CONFERENCE HEARING

BEFORE THE HONORABLE ONA T. WANG

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiff: CHALMERS, ADAMS, BACKER & KAUFMAN

BY: Alex B. Kaufman, Esq. 11770 Haynes Bridge Road Alpharetta, Georgia 30009

For Defendant: WINGET SPADAFORA & SCHWARZBERG LLP

BY: Kenneth A. McLellan, Esq.

Keith Roussel, Esq. 45 Broadway - 32nd Floor New York, New York 10006

ALSTON & BIRD, LLP

BY: STEVEN CAMPBELL, ESQ.

90 Park Avenue

New York, New York 10016

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording; Transcript produced by transcription service.

1	THE DEPUTY CLERK: This is 21-cv-491;
2	Garmashov versus United States Parachute
3	Association, Inc.
4	Counsel, please state your appearances
5	for the record.
6	MR. KAUFMAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
7	My name is Alex Kaufman, on behalf of Mr. Garmashov.
8	THE COURT: Good afternoon.
9	MR. McLELLAN: Good afternoon, Your
10	Honor. My name is Kenneth A. McLellan. I'm with
11	Winget Spadafora & Schwartzberg, representing United
12	States Parachute Association, Inc.
13	MR. ROUSSEL: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
14	My name is Keith Roussel. I'm from the law firm of
15	Winget Spadafora & Schwartzberg, also here on behalf
16	of the United States Parachute Association Corp.
17	THE COURT: Okay.
18	MR. CAMPBELL: Good afternoon, Your
19	Honor. Steven Campbell from the law firm Alston &
20	Bird, here on behalf of USPA. This is our client,
21	Your Honor.
22	THE COURT: Okay. Would you like to
23	introduce your client? Or you can introduce
24	yourself.
25	MR. BERCHTOLD: How are you doing?
	AMM TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE - 631.334.1445

PROCEEDINGS

Albert Berchtold on behalf of the United States
Parachute Association.

THE COURT: Okay. Oh, so you're -- we spoke on the phone, right, in some of the pre-settlement calls? Was that with you?

MR. BERCHTOLD: Yes, that was with me, Your Honor.

no. It's okay. We're here for a status conference. We are on the record, and I envision at the end of this conference asking you all to get a copy of the transcript and share the cost 50/50. I'm going to put that right out there. If we end up talking about confidential settlement issues, I would expect you to make a joint motion to seal the transcript, but I do want a full and complete transcript here because of the considerable acrimony in the history of this case.

All right. Bring me up to speed. I thought that Judge Koeltl had decided the motion to enforce the settlement and we were done. Does somebody want to talk to me? I guess we'll start with Mr. Kaufman if somebody wants to talk to me about what's happened since then.

MR. KAUFMAN: Well, Your Honor, our

position is that you're spot on. The motion to enforce was ordered on November 29, 2022. Payment has yet to be made. The judge was clear. The settlement terms were clear and unambiguous. The \$150,000 payment changed from mutual general releases, and as well as mutual confidentiality and no additional wrongdoing.

We pre-signed a mutual dismissal with prejudice, provided wiring instructions. Obviously, there's nothing else in the order. Surely, the judge then ordered us to then go ahead and come up with a settlement agreement. We did prepare what we thought was just those clear terms. It just never happened. We attempted to placate defendant's counsel who wanted a more robust settlement agreement. Their initial draft to us included terms that were far outside of what -- the clear parameters of the enforcery. Our view is an agreement was made. The judge affirmed that that agreement was made.

And I think it's important to note, Your Honor, that initial agreement from the mediation was from May 12, 2022, you know, so we're here a year later. Our view is that the attempts to get us a settlement agreement that both parties were

1 comfortable with was something that was unnecessary. 2 But if that's what they wanted to be attempted (indiscernible) to do that. Such things that were 3 put in their drafts included California releases. 4 We're here, obviously, under the laws of the State 5 6 of New York. They attempted to require Mr. Garmashov to have the document notarized as a 7 8 precondition. That was impossible for Mr. 9 Garmashov. He's in a city in Russia that is 16 10 hours or so drive to Moscow. There's reasons for 11 him not to go to Moscow right now, as the Court is 12 undoubtedly aware. 13 Additionally, if he did have to get 14 notarized -- of course, not a precondition, nor any 15 term that's in the order that Judge Koeltl 16 codified -- it would require him to have had the 17 entire agreement translated by a certified 18 translator into English and at considerable time and 19 expense. Again, unnecessary parameters. 20 There were parameters put forth in some

of their drafts that included joint motions to have the agreement sealed, as Judge Koeltl had released the settlement terms. Again, additional requirements.

21

22

23

24

25

And, you know, basically, if you just

took from that November date of Judge Koeltl's order -- I believe it was November 29th -- and ran the interest plus the additional attorney's fees and costs that we had to incur on behalf of Mr. Garmashov, which to date are \$27,807.59. Our view is this was clear and unnecessary. You know, defense counsel's claims, oh, you know, we reached a deal with (indiscernible) is just not true.

While that agreement contained most of the terms, one of the issues, of course, was now that Mr. Garmashov had incurred significant cost and was deprived of the use of that money, and has been living off credit cards and incurred additional expenses, as I mentioned, attorney's fees and costs of travel. I am barred in New York, but I reside in Atlanta. We -- you know, that interest rate, Your Honor, is \$19.85 a day, at least based upon the calculations put forth in my April attorney's fees affidavit.

Even if we did reach an agreement in February, which we don't consider that we did, you know, there's a provision in that last agreement, again, requiring a California release, which, as the Court knows, is different than a general release here in the state of New York. I'm not barred in

California. We'd have to get additional counsel so he can review that. Again, it's not part of the original initial settlement terms, and that provision not agreeable to Mr. Garmashov.

The result is he's been deprived, really, for a year of that money. And -- but our calculations were from the order date. And we believe that defense counsel could have done many things. If there was such a dispute, you could ask the Court for a clarification of what the word "execute" means, which is what Judge Koeltl told you you could execute. The word "execute" means to go forth and do it, which is -- again, the court found there was an agreement. There was no order to agree to a more robust writing, which, of course, is something that I believe -- I'm not in a position to tell district judges what they can and can't do, but I don't believe that's something that would have been in his purview or his intent.

They could have put the money in the registry of the court to mitigate this. They could have put it in our trust account it's subject to.

They didn't do that. And so the idea that they have tried to comply with the letter or spirit with the order sounds falsely. And the reality is,

Mr. Garmashov has now come to New York twice. Of course, we canceled last time at the last moment, and I know that they traveled as well. But, again, those costs were incurred by Mr. Garmashov. And, you know, he -- unfortunately, that's the position he's in. And we're here to try to get recompense for that additional 20 -- almost \$28,000 in additional costs and damages that he's incurred since the day of the order.

So that's why we're here. We've attempted to -- we've made offers. I'm not getting into settlement conversations, but I can tell you that the -- there was no counter involved of any substance. And, you know, their position was wait and see what Your Honor would do. We find that unfortunate. There were offers, well, we'll pay the money, but we'll have to deal with this.

I felt uncomfortable, given the relationship and the history of signing anything that had a mutual general release, even with a carve-out to have this issue heard. Again, the first time that was offered was February 22nd. And I believe, frankly, that's just too little too late.

Again, they could have sent the money to (indiscernible) punish Mr. Garmashov for whatever

Case	1:21-cv-04917-JGK Document 96-2 Filed 05/13/24 Page 10 of 42 9 PROCEEDINGS
1	reasons are out there.
2	I have full settlement authority. If the
3	Court does, you know, order us to come to resolve
4	this, I can contact Mr. Garmashov
5	THE COURT: Okay.
6	MR. KAUFMAN: (indiscernible).
7	THE COURT: All right. Great. Thank
8	you.
9	So just so I'm clear and this is a
10	question for everybody, all the counsel
11	Judge Koeltl's finding is that the e-mail, the
12	8:35 p.m., May 12, '22 e-mail, is when there is the
13	agreement, and it's just the terms that were agreed

to and confirmed in the 8:35 p.m. e-mail; is that

correct, Your Honor. May I respond to Counsel's

would like to say I envision us talking about this

in two separate pieces. Number one is I think it's

clear Judge Koeltl -- Judge Koeltl's ruling is quite

AMM TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE - 631.334.1445

MR. KAUFMAN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. What about from

MR. McLELLAN: Well, I believe that's

THE COURT: I'm not -- briefly. But I

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

right?

defendants?

presentation?

clear about the motion to enforce the settlement agreement. And the settlement agreement is that 8:35 p.m. e-mail, right? It doesn't include any other terms.

I think a separate issue is what's happened since November 29, 2022, which I would probably prefer to address after we have an -- after we come to understand why the settlement hasn't been consummated.

MR. McLELLAN: I can explain that, Your Honor, if I would have -- could have the opportunity, please.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. McLELLAN: The order calls for the Magistrate Judge, Your Honor, to supervise the execution of a settlement agreement. The -Judge Koeltl's order calls for the execution of a settlement agreement. You refer to an e-mail, Your Honor, but that doesn't contain the language of a general release. It doesn't contain a signature.

And our interpretation of the order is that we were entitled to that.

Counsel, in an e-mail that he sent to us right after the order was issued from Judge Koeltl initially said, we'd like you to wire us \$150,000,

but let us know if you have a different view, showing that there was at least two interpretations of the order possible. That wasn't our interpretation of the order, that Judge Koeltl's order required us to immediately wire \$150,000 to the order of plaintiff's counsel. We look to have a settlement agreement.

Counsel is referring to the California release issue. I don't want to get into that in too much detail, but I would only point out that this is the second lawsuit referable to this incident, meaning the second lawsuit having to do with Mr. Garmashov's membership having been terminated. The first lawsuit was brought in California by Mr. Kaufman's firm at the time. There is some law in California that raised concerns with my principals, and we simply wanted to address that in the release. I'm -- there should be no reason that Counsel should have any concern about that if the intent is for this to be the end of the lawsuit and my clients to be released, which that should be what happens after my client issues payment.

The rest of the issues that happened in terms of the settlement agreement were routine issues that happen when you go back and forth with

counsel. There was nothing unusual. But we did come to the point where, unfortunately, Counsel threaten -- began to threaten us and use more threatening language, which is when we wrote a letter to Your Honor on February 7th. And then Your Honor immediately ordered a settlement conference to be held in April, which was subsequently adjourned to today.

But the issue is, all of the billing that counsel generated that's attached to his motion to hold my clients in contempt -- which is without merit -- was billing that was incurred after we requested a conference. Counsel didn't need to do that. And, thereafter, we worked diligently. And recently who appeared in the case, Mr. Campbell of Alston & Bird was of great assistance to us. We worked on the settlement agreement.

Counsel now says that he disagrees that an agreement has been reached. But I'm here to report to the Court, happily, that it's our understanding -- and we have e-mails to that effect -- that the agreement language that we have come to with Mr. Kaufman mirrors the terms of the order of Judge Koeltl. And I understand that Mr. Garmashov, if he's living on credit cards, if

he's having that type of problem, if he signs this agreement that Mr. Kaufman has already agreed to, he could simply get paid within three days after that. So I'm not sure why he wants to do that, why he needs to live off credit cards.

The other issue is the terms that are in the present settlement agreement are innocuous terms, and we feel that Mr. Kaufman -- we understand that he believes the best way to protect his client is to make a motion for contempt. I have to be honest with you, Judge, in 25 years of practice, I've never had somebody make a motion for contempt before in this situation, especially when there's a settled case. And we now have a settlement agreement. It's simply not necessary, Judge. And it's racked up a lot of damages that Counsel didn't need to rack up. He brought a bazooka to kill a fly. It certainly wasn't necessary.

And Counsel indicates that there were negotiations. I don't want to get into the detail of the negotiations, but when we were just outside, Counsel's offer was the 100 percent of the amount of the claim damages on contempt. That's not negotiation in my book, Judge.

Thank you for listening. And I wanted to

agreement to you."

note that -- if I may, Mr. Campbell may have something to add. He's recently appeared in the case.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you, Your Honor.

Only one thing I wanted to add is that, prior to the order being issued, the parties understood that if a term -- if the term sheet was agreed to, if there was an agreement reached at the mediation, that there would be a long form settlement agreement memorializing those terms. And we -- this is in the record, but -- so the term sheet, as you pointed out earlier, what Judge Koeltl said were the terms of the agreement -- when plaintiff's counsel, Mr. Kaufman, e-mailed that term sheet to Mr. McLellan, he stated that if you -- if your client signs the term sheet -- now, I quote -- "We can move forward and we can render a final draft"

And then also in the record is an e-mail that Mr. McLellan sent to the mediator stating, "The USPA will require an agreement with a confidentiality provision and no admission of liability, among other standard terms."

I only say that because in interpreting

the order from Judge Koeltl, it was our understanding that both parties wanted to put that agreement into writing. And so it's extremely reasonable that USPA took that view.

And, in fact, while plaintiff, you know, reserved the right to object to that approach, plaintiff's counsel did engage in negotiating a settlement agreement. And so that's what the parties endeavored to do. They were unable to, for a couple of months, get there, but then by February 22nd, they did reach an agreement, which, as Mr. McLellan stated, plaintiff's counsel said mirrors Judge Koeltl's order.

So we have a settlement agreement that everyone agrees has the terms that need to be in there, nothing more, nothing less. And as soon as that's signed, USPA will pay within three days.

THE COURT: Now, what I heard from

Mr. Kaufman -- and he's shaking his head right

now -- is that the February 22nd -- the February

settlement agreement may mirror the terms of the

term sheet, but it adds certain things, certain

requirements that are unacceptable and that were not

on the term sheet, right?

MR. CAMPBELL: No. Well, that's -- I

1	disagree, Your Honor. The
2	THE COURT: Do you want to does
3	somebody want to hand up the draft February
4	settlement agreement and the term sheet? If you
5	have an unmarked
6	MR. McLELLAN: I have the confidential
7	agreement that in my according to me and
8	according to e-mail correspondence we had with
9	Mr. Kaufman, this is right, what I have right
10	here is what mirrors the terms of Judge Koeltl's
11	agreement. I'll be happy to hand it up. I don't
12	know if it's a court officer here or
13	THE COURT: My law clerk can take it.
14	MR. McLELLAN: May I approach or I
15	don't want to
16	THE COURT: Yes.
17	MR. CAMPBELL: Your Honor, if I may just
18	add that so we sent this new agreement. That's
19	when I came into the case. I took a look at it, and
20	I said, you know, let's just start from scratch. I
21	took Judge Koeltl's order in one hand.
22	THE COURT: When did you come into the
23	case again?
24	MR. CAMPBELL: Right. So it was after
25	I don't remember the exact date. I didn't make an

	PROCEEDINGS
1	appearance in the case until much later, about a
2	month after, I think, but it was after the motion
3	for contempt had been filed. It was about a week
4	before, I think a few days before I sent the new
5	agreement, and that was February 20th.
6	THE COURT: So this is what I'm
7	holding in my hand right now that Mr. McLellan has
8	handed up is what you're all talking about as the
9	February agreement?
10	MR. KAUFMAN: Yes.
11	MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.
12	THE COURT: Okay.
13	MR. McLELLAN: That's the February 22nd
14	agreement, Judge.
15	THE COURT: Okay.
16	MR. CAMPBELL: We sent that on
17	February 20th, and then plaintiff's counsel came
18	back
19	THE COURT: I don't I'm not into
20	I'm going to cut with a very I'm not even going
21	to call it a knife. I'm going to cut with a machete
22	right now, okay, because this case needs to be over.
23	You all need to go your separate ways, and you need
24	to move on, and you need to do this, and
25	Mr. Garmashov needs to get his money, all right.

So I'm seeing this settlement and
release. And, Mr. Kaufman, you're saying that while
the let me paraphrase in words that may be more
acceptable to defendants.

You're saying that the February 22nd agreement contains the terms from the term sheet, but it also adds additional terms. And those added additional terms or requirements are what are unacceptable.

MR. KAUFMAN: Yes, Your Honor. You're spot on.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. KAUFMAN: The California -- the language is in that version, and it still hasn't addressed -- it reserves the right for us to have this contempt issue, which the idea that we only incurred attorney's fees starting after -- with the filing is just inaccurate. The Court's got the record of the billing in the record.

THE COURT: All right. What's -- does somebody have a copy of the term sheet they can hand up?

MR. KAUFMAN: Yes, Your Honor. I have it digitally from the court -- I have the court's actual order, if that would please the Court.

actual unredacted... MR. CAMPBELL: I think this is -- this is

MR. McLELLAN: Yes, that's --

22

23

24

25

it, right?

MR. CAMPBELL: My apologies for the

PROCEEDINGS 1 highlighting. 2 THE COURT: Okay. That's okay. Okay, let me see. Well, the highlighting 3 4 or the --5 MR. CAMPBELL: This was -- this is what's 6 in the -- sorry, Your Honor. This is what was in 7 the record. This is --8 THE COURT: The redaction, yeah. No, 9 that's my problem. So we don't have -- nobody has 10 an unredacted --11 MR. KAUFMAN: Your Honor, if I can pull my e-mail for a second, I'll be able to --12 13 THE COURT: Okay. Yeah. 14 MR. KAUFMAN: (indiscernible). 15 THE COURT: Okay. Here, you can have 16 this back. 17 And so what will happen after you get a 18 copy of the transcript is that the transcript will 19 be available to you all for redaction, and then 20 you're going to redact maybe -- probably the 21 numerical amounts, or we'll redact certain sections. 22 You're going to agree on a section to redact, okay, 23 before it gets filed on the docket, or we may end 24 up -- depending on what this transcript looks like,

AMM TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE - 631.334.1445

we may just end up sealing the entire transcript.

25

MR. KAUFMAN: Your Honor, I apologize.

It looks like my firm only lets my e-mail go back to

November of 2022 (indiscernible).

THE COURT: Oh, dear.

MR. KAUFMAN: But we -- it is quoted.

Like I said, it is quoted in there. And those are the only terms there, and then Mr. Garmashov signed it. We can send it over. But I think the Court accurately describes the -- and I can probably find the -- if I go into the PACER, I can find it as an attached exhibit for our motion to enforce.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So when the USPA's offer went up to -- redacted -- membership was removed from the equation.

"Plaintiff's counsel then took the stance that only a higher offer would be considered. We and the USPA rightfully consider that as an abandonment of the request for membership."

Oh, I see. So the -- wait. So the case would settle for a specified sum of 150,000 with mutual dismissals with prejudice, mutual general releases of all claims and allegations, mutual confidentiality as to the terms of the agreement, but this is -- is this -- this order is unredacted, right? So --

MR. KAUFMAN: Yes, correct, it's -- to the world at this point, which was also our view of why it seemed -- and, of course, it means the general releases would be the same thing as mutual dismissal with prejudice, which is what we produced and signed and gave to counsel immediately to hold until we got the money wired.

THE COURT: Right. So that -- that set of terms -- "case would settle for a specified sum of 150,000 with mutual dismissals with prejudice, mutual general releases of all claims and allegations, mutual confidentiality as to the terms of the agreement, and no admission of liability by any party" -- those are the terms on the term sheet.

MR. KAUFMAN: That was it. It was just four bullet points, Your Honor, and our client signed it, and it was signed "mediation settlement agreement."

THE COURT: Okay. And that's what was handed up that -- where all the bullet points were redacted?

MR. KAUFMAN: Yeah. That's why I said the Court properly listed it. They said we had an agreement in principle. That was it. But at this point, it's -- you know, I can't do anything about

	PROCEEDINGS
1	the confidentiality. Mutual general releases,
2	again I'm going to take out your new microphone,
3	Your Honor.
4	Mutual general releases would be the same
5	as mutual dismissals. So our view is very simple
6	and we provided the wiring instructions. So wire
7	the money. You have the mutual dismissals with
8	prejudice. We're done.
9	THE COURT: Okay.
10	All right. Mr. McLellan?
11	MR. McLELLAN: Yes, Your Honor.
12	THE COURT: Yeah, what did you want to
13	say?
14	MR. McLELLAN: I just wanted to add
15	Counsel did refer, unfortunately, to the dollar
16	amount of the settlement in his motion to enforce
17	the settlement, so that cat got out of the bag. But
18	we still would like to have confidentiality in our
19	agreement. And it is in this
20	THE COURT: Even though the entire terms
21	are in a court order, ECF 63, and there was no
22	timely motion made to seal for that?
23	MR. McLELLAN: Your Honor, I don't think
24	counsel has any objection to there being

AMM TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE - 631.334.1445

25

confidentiality.

1	THE COURT: No, I don't think so either,
2	but I it's a little bit it's a the horse is
3	gone. The barn door is wide open. It has been wide
4	open since last November.
5	MR. McLELLAN: I understand
6	THE COURT: What's your point? And by
7	the way, Judge Koeltl would probably not be willing
8	to redact his order. So regardless of
9	confidentiality at this point going forward, sure,
10	you can agree to confidentiality, but it's all right
11	here in ECF 63.
12	MR. McLELLAN: Judge, I understand that.
13	We are not disputing that issue any longer.
14	THE COURT: Okay.
15	MR. McLELLAN: We understand that it
16	that the dollar amount was listed in the order, and
17	we're not we don't want to go back and revisit
18	that. We want to go forward.
19	The only issue is, is that we did want to
20	point out, in although this case is pending in
21	New York, there is an action brought under
22	California law in the complaint. It's in Count 4.

AMM TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE - 631.334.1445

Professional Code § 17200, which is what raised

It's violation of California Business and

concerns on my client's side.

23

24

25

1	THE COURT: Okay. Sit down, please.
2	Mr. Kaufman, tell me about the California
3	case. That's another case where your client's a
4	plaintiff?
5	MR. KAUFMAN: Well, Your Honor, we
6	originally filed the action in California. We
7	dismissed it and decided to bring it here for
8	logistical reasons. Mostly mainly because I'm
9	barred here and I switched
10	THE COURT: Okay. So why are we talking
11	about a California case? Why are we talking about
12	California law? Why do we care?
13	MR. McLELLAN: Judge?
14	THE COURT: Yeah, go ahead.
15	MR. McLELLAN: It's just no. What I'm
16	referring to is the California statute that is
17	raised in this case that's in New York. That's
18	this what I just read to you is Count 4 of the
19	complaint in this court, which is referable to the
20	California Business and Professional Code § 17200,
21	which, again, is what raised concerns on my
22	THE COURT: If you're dismissing this
23	case with prejudice, why does it matter?
24	MR. McLELLAN: That would be the question
25	I'd pose to Mr. Kaufman, why does he care
	AMM TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE - 631.334.1445

1	THE COURT: And why does it why is it
2	in here? I have a mind here's a couple things; I
3	have a mind to just oversee you all signing and
4	Mr. Kaufman can sign on behalf of his client. We
5	can get his client on the phone, as I understand,
6	ensure verbally that he has full authority to sign
7	on his behalf, and we can read the agreement to him.
8	But we can do this two ways, I propose.
9	One is we can take a clean copy of
10	ECS 63, bracket the language right there. You all
11	sign it. That's your settlement agreement. Or we
12	can take those terms, type it up into four bullets
13	again, and you all sign it again. What do you want
14	to do?
15	MR. McLELLAN: Your Honor, may I confer
16	with my client and co-counsel on this?
17	THE COURT: Sure.
18	MR. McLELLAN: May we
19	THE COURT: Yeah. You know what? Let's
20	take a break. You can go into the jury room, have a
21	conversation, and then just come out when you're
22	ready; okay?
23	MR. McLELLAN: Thank you, Judge.
24	(A recess was taken.)
25	THE COURT: All right.
	AMM TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE - 631.334.1445

MR. McLELLAN: Thank you, Your Honor, for
the opportunity to confer. I've spoken with our
my client. He's willing to execute the order that
Judge Koeltl issued, which becomes our settlement
agreement. And then he is willing to, when he
returns to his office, which is in the Washington,
D.C. area tomorrow he will be back in his office.
He can issue a check to Yuri Garmashov, which will
be overnighted to Mr. Kaufman's office.

THE COURT: Any thoughts, Mr. Kaufman?

MR. KAUFMAN: I'm fine with that, Your

Honor. That's all we wanted. I do, obviously, want
to address the contempt issue, the additional
damages Mr. Garmashov incurred for such a simple
solution.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. KAUFMAN: But we have no problem. I have authority. I just texted him.

THE COURT: Okay. Why don't we do this, why don't we print a clean copy of ECF 63 because I wrote on the one that I have, unless one of you has a clean copy. And why don't we just have you all sign, including Mr. Kaufman, even though I understand that Mr. Garmashov had already signed the previous term sheet. We'll just have you all sign

PROCEEDINGS 1 on the same document. 2 MR. KAUFMAN: No problem. THE COURT: Is that all right? Okay. 3 4 Does defense counsel have any issue at 5 all about whether Mr. Kaufman has the authority to sign on behalf of his client? 6 7 MR. CAMPBELL: If he represents that he 8 does, then we --THE COURT: Okay. All right. So just so 9 10 we're all clear, the language of the term sheet 11 appears at the bottom of page 3 of ECF 63, right, 12 that starts with, that the only terms delineated in 13 the draft were that, quote. And it goes through to 14 the closed quote, right? 15 MR. KAUFMAN: Yes, Your Honor. And just 16 for reference in the record, Exhibit 5 at 17 Document 37, which is our motion to enforce, had 18 the -- it was titled "Mediation Settlement Agreement 19

Terms and Conditions." That's where Judge Koeltl took those verbatim. It's just redacted in the public forum because we were trying to abide by our end of the confidentiality that it needed the Court, of course (indiscernible) --

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: He just decided that he would put them in the order.

	PROCEEDINGS
1	MR. KAUFMAN: Yes.
2	THE COURT: Okay. Let me just check to
3	see if there's an unredacted version of that visible
4	to court users.
5	So how did you do this when you made the
6	motion before Judge Koeltl; did you send unredacted
7	hard copies to him?
8	MR. KAUFMAN: I believe that's what we
9	did because we tried to
10	THE COURT: Okay.
11	MR. KAUFMAN: Or we maybe e-mailed his
12	staff attorney, Your Honor.
13	THE COURT: Okay.
14	MR. KAUFMAN: I'm not at the same firm as
15	what we did at the time, so
16	THE COURT: Okay.
17	MR. KAUFMAN: I don't have records.
18	And I don't have that file because that firm got hit
19	with a cyber attack, so we're that's the
20	situation.
21	THE COURT: All right.
22	MR. KAUFMAN: (indiscernible).
23	THE COURT: All right. So we'll go
24	forward with this somewhat unorthodox view. So I
25	guess I'll mark the section in red ink and point
	AMM TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE - 631.334.1445

	PROCEEDINGS
1	that out as the settlement, okay. This will become
2	the settlement agreement.
3	All right. So we're going to hand that
4	down, and I suppose you can each sign it.
5	MR. KAUFMAN: Okay, Your Honor. And for
6	the record, I'm signing now on behalf of
7	Mr. Garmashov, with authority as his attorney, as
8	well as I'll sign it in my capacity as well as
9	counsel of record. And I'm going to sign it with
10	blue ink.
11	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
12	MR. KAUFMAN: Your Honor, may I hand it
13	over to opposing counsel?
14	THE COURT: Please do.
15	MR. McLELLAN: Thank you, Counsel.
16	May I present this to my client for a
17	signature?
18	THE COURT: Please do.
19	MR. McLELLAN: I have a black-ink pen for
20	Mr. Albert Berchtold, the executive director of the
21	United States Parachute Association, to sign.
22	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
23	And please print your names under each of
24	your signatures if you haven't done so already.
25	MR. McLELLAN: Your Honor, before the

	PROCEEDINGS
1	excuse me. Before the Court, I'm signing my name as
2	counsel at page 3 in black ink at this time.
3	THE COURT: Okay.
4	MR. McLELLAN: I finished signing it,
5	Your Honor.
6	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
7	All right. My law clerk is going to just
8	take it so I can just take a look at it, and then
9	actually, just the page since the opinion order
10	is multiple pages, but the settlement agreement is
11	contained on that single page, 3, what we're going
12	to do is we're going to scan that page in color
13	because that page becomes your settlement agreement.
14	And then we'll either we can print out black and
15	white copies for you, and we can also e-mail you the
16	color copy; okay?
17	MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you.
18	MR. McLELLAN: Thank you, Judge.
19	THE COURT: All right. Hold on just
20	while we get that done.
21	(Pause in proceedings.)
22	THE COURT: All right. Just a minute
23	while we wait on this.
24	All right. So my law clerk is going to
25	take the agreement, scan just the page 3. We'll

Case 1:21-cv-04917-JGK		
1	e-mail copies to you. We'll bring you hard copies	
2	that are black and white, okay, so you each will	
3	have a copy to take with you.	
4	Just a minute.	
5	MR. KAUFMAN: Your Honor, just as a	
6	housekeeping matter, since I've switched firms, may	
7	I put on the record I'm handing my accurate mailing	
8	address via business card to counsel and his client?	
9	THE COURT: This is the one that's	
10	attached here?	
11	MR. KAUFMAN: Yes, Your Honor, that's	
12	correct.	
13	THE COURT: This is new firm? Okay.	
14	MR. KAUFMAN: Chalmers, Adams, Backer &	
15	Kaufman.	
16	THE COURT: Okay. Yeah.	
17	MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you.	
18	MR. McLELLAN: Thank you.	
19	THE COURT: All right. On to the	
20	motion for contempt is it's fully briefed, right?	

It's been fully briefed?

21

22

23

24

25

MR. KAUFMAN: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. McLELLAN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. The Court could construe that -- we're not going to decide it now,

okay, but I do want to reach -- try to reach some kind of closure on that since we do now have a signed settlement agreement.

Is -- we could construe it as a motion for attorney's fees. Is there -- or is there another -- you know, we could invite plaintiff to withdraw it. I could see potentially some reasons why they might be resistant, but -- you know, or is there briefing or supplemental briefing you might want to have -- if we were to construe it as a motion for attorney's fees, is there any supplemental briefing you might want to have in light of the fact that we now have a signed settlement agreement?

MR. KAUFMAN: Your Honor, from the plaintiff's perspective, we don't wish to withdraw that motion. You know, we've incurred about \$28,000 in attorney's fees. The only additional briefing, which would have been an updated affidavit based upon once I return home and what that total time and bill would be. I'm happy to stand in my place for the Court to give a -- you know, an estimate of what I believe it is on both sides so that we can proceed as of now. Otherwise it's fully briefed. And my preference is for -- you know, one is that -- just a

clear understanding that, yes, we've now signed the settlement agreement. We haven't released these bad faith claims or contempt claims or attorney's fees claims -- however the Court wishes to categorize it, just for clarification. And my hope would be to minimize any further cost and exposure and expense for Mr. Garmashov so he can move on with his life.

So we don't believe we need any additional briefing. If the Court would want an updated affidavit, I can -- of course, the math is -- math is we put in the interest rate, although I heard the Feds raised it a quarter of a point today, but I don't want to go back to it.

THE COURT: We're not going to go there.

Look, I will tell you -- so you had incurred -- your client had incurred about 28,000 in fees and costs since -- up to when? What's the date range that that covers?

MR. KAUFMAN: Your Honor, that covers and has been in the accurate form since Judge Koeltl's order on November -- I believe it was the 29th, 2022, up to and through today.

THE COURT: Through today, the 28,000?

MR. KAUFMAN: Well, the 28,000, exactly,
that's through today. My affidavit was, I believe,

4 or \$5,000 less, but, of course, I -- we've had to incur airfare to come here, brief preparing, and then being here in court.

THE COURT: Okay. Okay.

MR. KAUFMAN: (indiscernible). And the additional month of the interest, which is about \$600 or so.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Go ahead, Mr. McLellan.

MR. McLELLAN: Thank you, Your Honor. I appreciate the opportunity to be heard, and I appreciate your assistance with the settlement agreement today.

The billing I have from counsel begins on February 8, 2023, for the drafting of the motion for contempt. I don't have billing from earlier than that for Counsel. With respect, I understand Counsel is from Atlanta, but he brought the case in New York, and there were adjournments that were beyond our control. We don't believe that our client should be charged for that.

And if I could, since Counsel did have the opportunity to submit an affidavit, I would like the opportunity to submit a brief response to that along those lines if counsel is not going to

withdraw it. I certainly don't want to burden the Court, Mr. Garmashov or my own client, for that matter, but if the motion is going to be heard, short brief, and that could be done by next Friday.

THE COURT: Okay. I anticipate this being on the papers. I really don't want any of you -- now that we have a signed settlement agreement, I would really prefer that we all be able to move on from this case.

And although I don't think it has been referred to me, but -- oh, maybe it has. I was just looking at the docket header, and my initials are right after Judge Koeltl's, which suggests that it's already been referred, but I would construe it as a motion for attorney's fees.

I -- here's what I would suggest, why don't we give it a week for everything to cool down, for money to come in -- (indiscernible due to audio skipping) on the motion for attorney's fees.

I think you all have been able to detect by the words I have said and the tone I have used that I would prefer not to have to address it, but I will address it, if need be.

The other question I had is, is the February agreement part of the briefing right now?

1 Mr. Kaufman, you're shaking your head. 2 MR. KAUFMAN: As part of the brief -yes. And just one point of clarification --3 4 THE COURT: It's in the briefing. Okay. 5 MR. KAUFMAN: And it's in -- and that's 6 part of what the attorney's fees are going back and forth. And Mr. McLellan Makes an excellent point. 7 8 The fees that I can show right now are just since I 9 was at my new firm. The old firm, as I mentioned 10 earlier, had a cyber attack, but we were clearly 11 going back and forth since November. So this is a 12 low estimate of what these attorney's fees numbers 13 are --14 THE COURT: Okay. 15 MR. KAUFMAN: -- Mr. Garmashov as to what 16 he's received. Unfortunately, my prior firm, Hall 17 Booth Smith, can't -- one of these was attackers 18 there, for the record. 19 THE COURT: That's rough. 20 MR. KAUFMAN: Hence, why they're there. 21 But a point of clarification, I wanted the Court to 22 know, these are on the lower end because they're 23 missing three or four months. And that, of course, 24 is associated working with me here as well as in

AMM TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE - 631.334.1445

just my time. And these were iterations back and

25

forth and calls with counsel and e-mails.

Your Honor, in light of your direct words and insinuations, perhaps you could order us to take 10, 15 minutes to attempt to negotiate it because we have a resolution and we want to read it on the record and be completely finished, as they have counsel and a party with authority, and I can have Mr. Garmashov available right now.

THE COURT: Yeah. You know what, though, I do, unfortunately, have something that is supposed to be starting in two minutes that I have to take in chambers, so -- but what I -- here's what I will do, I will put an outside date for you to write a joint letter in about whether you were able to resolve it. And if not, then you propose some -- you know, some dates for supplemental briefing.

attorney's fees records for Mr. Kaufman, consider whether you might either agree to a number or allow me, if I end up having to decide an attorney's fees motion, to try to triangulate that number based on defense counsel's billing records, okay.

I mean, that's -- those are some of the ways that you might try to -- want to try to work this out. But I also do want to give you some time

to cool down a little bit after the money's been sent, after everything is said and done.

What I'm going to do is I am going to provisionally docket the settlement agreement as a sealed document. Judge Koeltl may have other ideas, particularly because it's really not contributing anything. It's not hiding anything other than the -- you know, what's already out there and is not going to be taken back. So I'm going to provisionally docket it, but leave it up to Judge Koeltl whether, you know, it should be public or not, okay.

So I'll give Mr. McLellan his clean copy of the February agreement back. And is there anything else we need to do at this time?

MR. KAUFMAN: No. Although, certainly (indiscernible) we can work it out now, it sounds like if Your Honor is here and we can reach a resolution, would we be able to bother you to put it on the record and be finished if we are successful?

THE COURT: You know what you could do, you could actually write it out and sign it all, okay, and then give it -- and then leave it with my clerk, or, you know, just e-mail chambers if you can, or call chambers and let us know it's here,

Case	1:21-cv-04917-JGK
1	because I will not be able to physically be
2	available starting from about right now, okay.
3	MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
4	THE COURT: All right. No, thank you,
5	all, for your time. Thank you for coming in.
6	Anything else from defense counsel?
7	MR. McLELLAN: Not from me, Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: Okay. So how about let's
9	give you two weeks. That would be May 17th for
10	I'll call it a joint status letter on the docket.
11	Joint status letter, May 17th on any outstanding
12	issues, okay.
13	MR. KAUFMAN: And will that date also be
14	put as a docket order?
15	THE COURT: Yes.
16	MR. KAUFMAN: Okay. Thank you.
17	THE COURT: Yeah. Okay. All right.
18	Thank you very much, everyone. All right. We are
19	adjourned.
20	Again, requesting the parties order a
21	copy of the transcript. Share the cost 50/50.
22	
23	000

23 000

24

25

AMM TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE - 631.334.1445